BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF QUEEN CITY SHEET METAL AND ROOFING, INC., Appellant, PCHB No. 534 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, vs. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent.

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

THIS MATTER being an appeal of a \$50.00 civil penalty for allegedly causing or permitting the emission of excessive odors from tarring operations in violation of Respondent's Regulation I; having come on regularly for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board on the 1st day of July, 1974, at Seattle, Washington; and appellant. Oueen City Sheet Metal and Roofing, Inc., appearing through John H. Ober and respondent, Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency, appearing through Keith D. McGoffin; and Board members present at the hearing being Walt 18 Woodward, (presiding Officer) and Chris Smith; and the Board having

I | considered the sworn testimony, exhibits, records and files herein and naving entered on the 11th day of July, 1974, its proposed Findings of 2 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, and the Board having served said 3 proposed Findings, Conclusions and Order upon all parties herein by certified mail, return receipt requested and twenty days having elapsed 5 from said service; and 6 7 The Board having received exceptions to said proposed Findings, Conclusions and Order from appellant and having considered and denied 8 same; and the Board being fully advised in the premises; now therefore, 9

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, dated the 11th day of July, 1974, and incorporated by this reference herein and attached hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as the Board's Final Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order herein.

DONE at Lacey, Washington, this 62 cay of August, 1974.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

WALT WOODWARD, Charmak

CHRIS SMITH, Member

21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, | CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 27 AND ORDER

BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF QUEEN CITY SHEET METAL 4 AND ROOFING, INC., PCHB No. 534 5 Appellant, FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 vs. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 7 PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

10

17

This matter, the appeal of a \$50.00 civil penalty for allegedly 11 12 causing or permitting the emission of excessive odors from tarring operations in violation of Respondent's Regulation I, came before the 13 14 Pollution Control Hearings Board, Walt Woodward (presiding officer) 15 and Chris Smith, at a formal hearing in Seattle, Washington at 9:30 a.m., 16 July 1, 1974.

Appellant appeared through John H. Ober; Respondent appeared 18 through Keith D. McGoffin. Sherri Darkow, Olympia court reporter, recorded the proceedings.

 $2\pm$ 

 $^{27}$ 

Having heard the testimony, examined the exhibits and being fully advised, the Board makes the following

## FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

Appellant engages in tarring operations which include the tasks of constructing built-up roofing and wall insulation using tar as an ingredient. Appellant is located at 1711 Occidental South in Seattle.

The alleged violation occurred in an alley behind lll - 1st Avenue South in Seattle (King County) near the Maynard Hotel.

II.

Appellant was engaged in tarring operations upon the Maynard Hotel on 1st Avenue in Seattle on December 18-22, 1973 and on February 1, 1974. While its employees were working on the hotel, the tar kettle from which hot tar was supplied was left in the alleyway and attended by an operator.

III.

On December 18, 1973 in response to a complaint about tar odor, David H. Walls and James D. Parsons, air pollution inspectors for the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA), visited the alley where the tar kettle was operating. They found one operator in attenda and a tar kettle with its lid open in which tar was boiling and smoking Mr. Parsons issued a Notice of Violation to Mr. Kelley, the kettle operator. No Notice of Civil Penalty was issued for this violation.

IV.

On February 1, 1974 at 10:30 a.m. in response to another complaint

David H. Walls and Walter D. DeHaan, air pollution inspectors for PSAPCA, visited the same alley on lll - 1st Avenue South. They went to the Glasswater Leather Works, the complainant, and noticed a very strong tar smell throughout the complainant's retail and manufacturing areas. Thereafter, these two inspectors located the source of the tar odor. The lid of the tar kettle was propped open, through which boiling tar could be seen and from which bluish-white smoke and fumes were escaping. The Appellant's tar kettle operator, Danny L. Ditton, was in charge of the kettle and accepted the Notice of Violation No. 9000 issued by Mr. Walls for the odor.

ř

 $^{23}$ 

 $^{24}$ 

 $^{27}$ 

v.

From the Notice of Violation No. 9000 was assessed a Notice of Civil Penalty No. 1410 for an amount of \$50.00 pursuant to Respondent's Regulation I, which is the subject matter of this appeal.

VI.

Respondent's witnesses, Jerry Raine, Mark Stein, and Buddy Hanna, testified as to the "severe" and "obnoxious" odor from the tar kettle that permeated their shop during the periods of Appellant's operation. Two employees became sick and left work because of the strong smell. Customers in the shop also noticed the strong odor. Inspector Walls rated the odor in this area as 4 on a scale of 5. Inspector DeHaan rated the odor in the same area as 3 on a scale of 5. A rating of 5 on the odor scale would mean that the smell was very, very strong. This test was a subjective test requiring the concurrence in opinion of two inspectors before a violation was deemed to have occurred. None of Appellant's employees became ill from this odor.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER VII.

į.

1

Ç

3

4

5

6

S

9

10

11

12

13

1.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

 $^{27}$ 

€

Appellant could have avoided the odor if a tanker, rather than a tar kettle, was used in the operation. However, the use of the tanker in this area was prohibited by the Fire Department because it used propane as a fuel. The tar kettle, which was fueled with kerosene, was ultimately used. The operation of this kettle required an operator who was required to keep the tar temperature between 425-500 degrees. When the tar became too hot more smoke and fumes were emitted. Also, the tar was likely to "flash" and catch on fire. In order to lower the tar temperature in this event, the fuel supply was turned off and the kettle lid opened. Maintaining a proper temperature between 425-500 degrees would have avoided excessive smoke and odor.

## VIII.

Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter recited which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

The Board has jurisdiction over the persons and subject matter of this appeal.

II.

Appellant's Motion to Dismiss on the grounds that the Notice of Civil Penalty pursuant to Section 3.29 of Respondent's Regulation I lacked particularity in describing the violation is denied. The Notice of Violation which Appellant received reasonably describes the

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

violation and is incorporated in the Notice of Civil Penalty. 1 III. 2 The preponderance of the evidence shows that a severe and 3 objectionable odor was caused or permitted by Appellant on February 1, 4 This odor was in the nature of an air contaminant that causes 5 "detriment to the health, safety or welfare" to any person, or "causes 6 damages to property or business". Section 9.11 of Respondent's 7 Regulation I. 8 IV. 9 Appellant violated Section 9.11 of Respondent's Regulation I. 10 v. 11 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law 2 is hereby adopted as such. 13 Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board issues this 14 ORDER 15 The appeal is denied and the \$50.00 civil penalty assessed against 16 Appellant is affirmed. 17 DONE at Lacey, Washington this 18 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

26

27

5